



Rebuild Iowa Advisory Commission Meeting Notes

November 6-7, 2008
Sheraton West Des Moines
1800 50th Street
West Des Moines, IA 50266

November 6, 2008 – 12:00 - 5:00 pm

Commission Members

Major General Ron Dardis, Chair, Johnston
Bill Bywater, Iowa City
Jim Davis, Charles City
Mike Earley, Des Moines
Brent Halling, Perry
Mike King, Creston
Linda Larkin, Fort Madison (Nov. 7 only)
Nitza Lopez-Castillo, Columbus Junction
Carroll Reasoner, Cedar Rapids (by phone)
Amy Truax, Parkersburg
Mark Wandro, Ankeny
Bev Wharton, Sioux City

Staff

Adam Bartlett, Rebuild Iowa Office (RIO), Des Moines
Amelia Colwell, SPPG, Des Moines
Tim Criner, Rebuild Iowa Office, Des Moines
Brooke Findley, SPPG, Des Moines
Jennifer Furler, SPPG, Des Moines
Emily Hajek, Rebuild Iowa Office, Des Moines
Arlinda McKeen, SPPG, Des Moines
Dave Miller, Homeland Security and Emergency Management Division (HSEMD), Johnston
Ann Poe, Rebuild Iowa Office, Cedar Rapids
Tina Potthoff, Rebuild Iowa Office, Des Moines
Ron Randazzo, Rebuild Iowa Office, Des Moines
Bill Riley, Rebuild Iowa Office, Des Moines
Drew Sachs, JLWA, Rebuild Iowa Office, Des Moines
Ken Tow, Rebuild Iowa Office, Des Moines
Lynn Zook, Rebuild Iowa Office, Des Moines

Observers

Janeane Beck, Iowa Public Radio
Jason Clayworth, Des Moines Register
Dale Crozier, MFL MarMac Schools
Hanna DeGroot, Iowa State Association of Counties

David Eberbach, Iowa Institute for Community Alliances
Susan Gugurich, FEMA and ESF 14
Carolann Johnson, Senate Republican Caucus
Theresa Kehoe, Senate Democratic Caucus
Max Knauer, Publisher of the Independent Iowan
Rox Laird, Des Moines Register
Sue Lerdal, Legislative Fiscal Bureau
James Lynch, Cedar Rapids Gazette
Ray Maylor
Kim McDermott, Legislative Services Agency
Joe Romano, House Democratic Research Staff
Duane Sand, Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation
Senator Jim Seymour, Iowa General Assembly

Welcome and Opening Comments

Major General Ron Dardis greeted and thanked the Commission members for again offering their expertise and time to the important purpose of Iowa's recovery from the spring and summer disasters. He welcomed the Commission members on behalf of Governor Culver and Lt. Governor and RIO Executive Director Patty Judge. He thanked the Commission members for their generosity and willingness to work on behalf of all Iowans as a member of the Rebuild Iowa Advisory Commission. He noted that Carroll Reasoner is joining by phone. He added that the Governor and Lt. Governor, just like last time, decided this is the Commission's day for discussion. The Commission has the support and encouragement of the Governor and Lt. Governor in its work today, and the Governor and Lt. Governor look forward to receiving the 120-Day Report.

Dardis asked the group to go around the room and introduce themselves. He announced that Karris Golden is unable to participate, but RIO staff has been in communication with her.

He noted that this afternoon and tomorrow morning the Commission has the opportunity to bring together the big ideas and the hopes and the expectations that have come from the Task Forces' work in response to the Governor's challenge in Executive Order Number Seven. The Rebuild Iowa Advisory Commission members are charged with developing a vision for Iowa's long-term recovery. By the time the Commission finishes this meeting, that vision will be decided. The Commission also has the responsibility to advise the Governor by offering strategies that will get the state closer to that vision. Dardis noticed that the SPPG team – Arlinda McKeen, Jennifer Furler, and staff – are again here to support and facilitate discussions and have worked closely with him in laying out the scope of the work for these two days. The first 45-Day Report and the work leading to it were focused on the immediate needs and the group identified some important elements that needed attention right away, with a real sense of urgency.

Major General Dardis recognized that progress has been made on many fronts since then. This meeting's discussion will turn to the longer term recovery perspective, with a more strategic focus. He recognized that the challenge for the Commission is to develop the messages for the 120-Day Report, to think of what Iowa needs to be like in 10 or 20 years, and aim for that through our long term recommendations and strategies.

Dardis noted that this also means we need to maintain that 60 thousand-foot level of vision. In discussions, it will be important to give the readers – including the RIO and policymakers –

enough information and detail so they understand the intent. At the same time, the Commission needs to leave these stakeholders with the latitude to determine how best to implement the recommendations and strategies. Major General Dardis also reminded the group to remember the nature of their role as participants in an advisory process. He introduced McKeen and Furler to review the process for the meeting that will be used to achieve these results.

Review of the Agenda and Outcomes

Arlinda McKeen and Jennifer Furler again welcomed the Commission and shared the plan for the afternoon and tomorrow morning. McKeen recognized the need for everyone to speak loudly at the meeting due to background noise from fans and so that Reasoner can participate fully by phone. McKeen recognized the importance of the group working closely together and covering all of the issues on the Commissioner's minds to make the 120-Day Report at least as compelling as the 45-Day Report. She recognized that the group will begin with updates to provide context for discussion, and a review of the 45-Day Report will follow. She recognized that there is no formal evening meeting or activity schedule. On the morning of the 7th, the meeting will begin at 8:30 am. She noted that it would be important to recognize that the work required from this meeting will extend into two days. One component that McKeen recognized for emphasis is the fact that Iowa has made history through this recovery process. The state has gone through the process in a thoughtful manner by creating the Commission and that this recovery will likely be used as a model for other parts of the country and will be serving as a model, or at least will be providing lessons learned. The idea of this effort is that much of the work of the Commission applies to future disasters in Iowa as well.

Rebuild Iowa Office Activities

Dardis recognized that since the Commission last met five weeks ago and provided an update, there are additional developments, and new components of the recovery efforts. Major General Dardis turned the floor over to Emily Hajek, the Chief of Staff at the Rebuild Iowa Office. Hajek noted that many RIO staff members were present at the meeting; she provided updates to amounts Iowa has or will receive from the major funding sources related to the recovery effort. Hajek also outlined a news release from last week that provided recent updates. The Jumpstart program has been growing. The housing and small business program are making a switch to using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, and the Rebuild Iowa Office is trying to make that transition as smooth as possible and address some of the federal requirements that are tied to this new source of funding. A lot of money has been requested for this program and CDBG will continue to replenish it as long as possible. Right now, the RIO has requested \$85 million in CDBG funds, and already knows that another \$72 million is coming. Another \$6.5 billion has been allocated from Congress nationwide, and it has been noted that a total of \$2.2 billion will be allocated by the end of the month. Currently, Iowa is working very hard to indicate why this support is needed in Iowa. The next part of that \$6.5 billion may not be allocated until after the new administration has taken over. Dardis asked how many states were involved in the \$6.5 billion. Hajek recognized that 66 disasters are involved, with 36 states included. Iowa, Texas, and Louisiana are expected to see the bulk of that money. Other federal programs are also providing some funding for the rebuilding efforts. The United States Department of Agriculture has several programs. One of the quickest-moving is the Federal Watershed Program which might make decisions as early as next week. Also, in the last appropriation, the United States Department of Health and Human Services received \$6.6 million in new Social Service Block Grant funds. There are definite needs in Iowa for services related to these funds. Iowa is staying in close contact and providing information to help make those decisions. Housing is still a big focus, many people are set up in temporary housing that are still in need of permanent placement. The state of Iowa has the Jumpstart money to help people repair homes and buy new ones. The new round of CDBG funding will assist with rental properties. Iowa has

also received a new \$2.5 million in tax credits is available to support production of housing. These tax credits need to be expended by the end of the year or else the state loses them. The RIO will be working to find the right projects for this opportunity.

The RIO has received Notices of Intent from more than 35 communities with lists of homes that may need buyout support. It is understood that these lists may shrink a lot as communities go through their decision process and refine this list, so many may drop off. The final lists are due in January. This is a mitigation program; if homes remain on the list and are bought out using FEMA mitigation funds, they will become permanent green space and ineligible for future development. This list-making is the first step for that program.

Mental health is a big concern. The Iowa Department of Human Services (DHS) was granted an extension of the Immediate Service Program (ISP). This provides \$1 million, and requires \$3.4 million for a Regular Service Program (RSP), which is the next step. The RIO is working with DHS to design a media and public service announcement campaign to get the word out about this opportunity and service availability. It is the intent of the RIO and DHS that people know where to access help if needed. The RIO has a team working out in communities working alongside FEMA's ESF 14 program to assist in recovery. FEMA's teams will be leaving by end of the year and state folks will stay on the ground providing services in these communities.

Case management has been moving forward in planning, and the RIO has tentatively identified funding from CDBG to support continuing development of this service. The state is moving forward to help beef up non-profit and faith-based systems currently in place. Part of this challenge is making sure that the system is consistent and that those who are working through case management have the correct information. Hajek shared that the RIO is hoping to be able to secure that funding and move ahead with case management in the next few months. The RIO is serving as a clearinghouse and is gathering information about programs available to small and independent businesses and others. More information about the RIO's work in this capacity will be shared on the RIO website soon. The RIO is working with the Department of Economic Development on a conference which is scheduled for December 9-10 in Coralville. The conference is primarily focused on city planners, engineers, leaders, small business owners, and contractors to assist with information sharing to plan for rebuilding. Hajek encouraged Commission members to attend and assist in sharing information about the Conference with those who may be interested.

The Rebuild Iowa Office is also in the process of putting together a team to carry forward Commission's recommendations. More information will be shared about this as it becomes available. A briefing was recently held to educate stakeholders on the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Participants shared that the information was extremely useful.

Dardis thanked Hajek for the update and for all of her hard work leading the RIO.

Task Force Meetings Review and Key Issues Highlighted

McKeen thanked Hajek for the new information and the additional background for the day's conversations. She also thanked the observers for their interest and asked those in attendance to introduce themselves. She thanked the group for being interested and taking time from their busy days to be here. She recognized the importance of having this interest as the group plans for Iowa's future. Many of the Task Forces talked about the same issues at the first meeting as at the second meetings. In the first meetings, conversations concentrated upon immediate needs, with many attendees reluctant to think much into the future. Since then, the Task Forces have moved further along in their acceptance of the situations and plans. This acceptance and

additional time to reflect was apparent at each of the meetings. She asked the group to share information about the second set of Task Force meetings that the Commission should keep in mind for their work in the next couple of days. Furler noted that in the first round of Task Force meetings, it was important to stay on the topic, in the second, many of the long-term issues crossed over many of the Task Force issue areas.

Commission members started with discussing a broader perspective of watershed management, and many discussed zoning and land use. The groups need to keep looking at gaps in the system in order to meet those needs and inspire businesses and others to keep working hard and recover. With existing infrastructure there were a lot of unmet needs prior to the disaster. Many Commission members recognized that an investment needs to be made for future generations in wastewater treatment, sewer systems, electrical, and other types of infrastructure. There are some concerns with investing in efficiencies with power, especially concerning grids. The group noted that many of the issues that did not make it into the top ten in the 45-Day Report will be more important for the 120-Day Report. McKeen recognized that discussion of many of the subsequent recommendations from the 45-Day report really turned into questions about how items were going to be funded. In the second round of Task Force meetings, the attendees thought with a lot more vision, saying, although there were not known solutions to paying for what needs to be done, there was a recognition that some items needed to be accomplished, no matter if it is known how they will be paid for at this time.

In education, some school districts are more involved than other in local emergency response and mitigation. It is important that training and development topics in the 120-Day Report include schools being involved in emergency planning. Looking toward the future of the state, school buildings have changed, such as being built with more windows and less underground space. As these changes have come about, some of the safety standards have changed. Statewide building standards were discussed, but Commission members noted that the Education Task Force did not include that as a recommendation due to concerns by some. It was agreed to strengthen response and shorten time limits for decision-making for schools to make transactions such as selling property. The Commission recognized that the schools in Iowa that were in affected areas and those that responded were very collegial in working out solutions to problems, and this helped get the school year off to a very good start.

McKeen agreed, adding that it is notable that schools worked together to think through issues such as per-pupil reimbursement and other items to make sure that every student in Iowa was still able to be served. Going forward, these items should be vetted and best practices institutionalized. Impact on property taxes will need to be studied in the future. In these affected areas, many are curious on if there was an immediate effect on property tax revenues, and how that would translate into effects on the school district budgets. Commissioners shared examples of displacement of students. In Aplington-Parkersburg, two students were reported displaced. Cedar Rapids reported a decline in enrollment of 370, 120 likely to do with the flood. Columbus Junction had some loss of students, which was thought to be mostly economic rather than flood related. McKeen recognized that there is some movement in enrollment always to be expected naturally from year to year. Nothing in this disaster seems to have an isolated impact; there are ripple impacts that cut across many areas.

Commission members reported that very little new came up in the second Economic and Workforce Development Task Force meeting. One common element for both the first and second Task Force meetings was the need to protect citizens and take care of each other in an emergency. This was a change in emphasis from “where is the money so I can get back to my life and business.” The discussion was about process and bureaucracy in its summer meeting.

The second meeting focused on accountability, and how Iowans can be careful about where they make investments, what assurances can be made that it will not happen again, what type of early warning can be put into place. Floodplain mapping cannot be used for prediction, which was disappointing to some, but it is still very beneficial. In Cedar Rapids, the situation this summer could be accounted for under "weird weather." Iowans are accustomed to a record being broken by an inch, but in Cedar Rapids it was broken by 30 feet. Due to that, it will be hard to make everyone whole. It is, perhaps, not as important to get the money out quickly as it is to set up practices and processes for the next time and make things stronger so that this level of damage will not happen again.

There is a need to have modeling and we have some interest from a hydrology center at The University of Iowa, which is a real resource the state can take advantage of. In the second meeting of the Flood Plain Management and Hazard Mitigation Task Force, the group started to think upstream about watersheds and what could be done. The Task Force adopted the concept of storm water retention and detention, the way it is handled in some cities. The Commission described how some have discussed backing up tiles and culverts as a long term plan and providing incentives to get people to do that. In Cedar Rapids, there is a lot of talk about hazard mitigation. Ideas such as a second spillway for the Coralville Reservoir and other interesting concepts were also discussed. The Commission discussed how there has been less talk of dredging as many are looking a bit differently going forward.

McKeen agreed with that review of the Task Force work, and recognized that they looked in tandem at floodplain mapping and flood insurance and how the policy is connected through these items. Recognizing impacts will inform many types of decisions going forward. This conversation will have to be held as a state and cannot be ignored as the Commission's discussion moves forward.

With regard to Agriculture and Environment, the Task Force agreed at the first meeting that most agriculture issues were long term, and that nothing would be more important in the short term than getting people in houses and putting their lives back together. Land use issues are important, and Iowa has made huge leaps ahead in the last several decades. The state has looked at what worked and how well it worked in disasters. This enforced the idea that land use practices and comprehensive planning really works. More disaster-related aspects of land use included information sharing in a more comprehensive way and water quality and health concerns needing to be handled quickly. It is an easy adjustment to meet these needs.

The issue of waste management facilities and landfills in a disaster of this magnitude is also an important issue. It takes a lot of space and resources to deal with waste and landfills that will continue to be inundated in certain affected areas during the demolition and rebuilding process. All of that extra waste has to go somewhere. All of these issues have an effect on the county tax rolls and budgets as well. The floodplain management and infrastructure issues were a top priority for those agriculture stakeholders as well. Commission members also recognized that the levee issue, along with many advocates and schools of thought, were an important part of the discussion at both Agriculture and Environment Task Force meetings.

Commission members recognized that the issue of funding county Emergency Management Coordinators was also an important discussion in many Task Force meetings. Having a solid infrastructure of well-funded and prepared local systems is a top priority. Commission members noted that the amount of work that local emergency managers have to do in non-disaster times keep people busy enough, in order to get federal dollars and maintain qualifications for assistance if something does happen is an even greater burden on the system.

The Long Term Recovery Task Force also discussed the local emergency management system at length, and there are many schools of thought about how to best to manage this issue. Throughout the state by county, there is a huge difference in preparedness and staffing, as well as priority, often depending upon size of counties. Many larger counties think that they have put enough into the system that they do not want to change. McKeen recognized that this is not a new issue and not one that is easily solved or it would have been solved years ago. Furler recognized that local Emergency Management was also a part of the discussion in the Public Health Task Force. County emergency management programs have a role in engaging and assisting organizations in preparing that is very important.

Housing is recognized as remaining at the top of the list of concerns and priorities. These are people's homes, so there is more than just sheetrock at stake. People continue to need case management to navigate the system and they also need help with the psychological trauma that goes along with losing your home. Progress has been made, but many also had frustrations that were voiced that the pace and amount of funding available was not acceptable. As we look long term, it is important to keep some consistency from the first Task Force meetings, Commission meetings, and 45-Day Report. The bottom line is that the Commission wants to build housing, but the undeniable fact is that it is difficult. The state already has a housing authority tasked with doing this. Continuing to find ways to incentivize this process is important. It is also critical to design these homes in a way that meets the needs of those living in the houses. McKeen noted that it is important to think about what kind of communities people would like to live in for the future.

The Commission discussed that non-profit organizations are in a particularly tough position as they were not receiving assistance money since they are not having money coming in from any other sources. A good example is a Senior Center; since there is no money coming in from providing services or from disaster assistance, there are no plans to rebuild and very few opportunities to do so.

McKeen recognized that the group comes together as a Commission, but these are our neighbors that the group is discussing today. McKeen asked those present to share examples to put some context around the issues to be decided and recommended. The situation is very different for those affected by tornadoes where many were covered by insurance. Some who have begun to move back into their houses almost feel bad about telling others about it, as many are still in limbo. Businesses are waiting to rebuild, and it is very difficult to wait patiently. People are under pressure to rebuild their businesses, even if they are still struggling with deciding if it is the best move for them. Some decisions being made in Parkersburg are pushing plans that would have been made in the future to the forefront. Some elderly residents are moving to assisted living facilities instead of back into their homes. The speed that FEMA is reimbursing counties can be slow as the southern part of the United States is also dealing with their own devastation. Many are lacking information about how they are getting paid, and they are concerned that there is no rhyme or reason to the assistance. In many cases, the state has also not reimbursed counties for their 10 percent cost share. All in all, the Councils of Government are doing a good job assisting communities, making people more accountable and engaging people, not just handing out money. Many Commission members expressed that their biggest concern regarding their work was about the people, their safety and happiness.

McKeen asked for information about how the damage repair for roads has been progressing. As the local contractors and supplies have been affected, it is difficult to conduct repairs in a timely way. It was recognized that FEMA is stretched very thin and are doing the best they can with

limited resources.

Dardis asked Miller to comment on the concerns of the 10 percent match to counties. Miller recognized that generally under the Public Assistance Program, even with the 90-10 cost share, these are separated into large and small projects. Small projects are paid to the community in advance after the agreement has been reached, which includes the state 10 percent share. Most of the projects that the state is dealing with now are large projects, and just 90 percent of the costs of these projects is advanced, and the state's 10 percent is held until project is completed and everything is reconciled. The state takes this approach to make sure that the applicant is not asked to give money back.

McKeen recognized a common general lack of knowledge about County Emergency Management Agencies by many in the population. Emergency Management Commissions are separate municipalities with all of the rights and responsibilities of municipalities other than taxing authority, and, by law, are made up of mayors or designees from each town, one County Supervisor, and the County Sheriff. Along with being a member of the Emergency Management Commission comes the requirement to be responsible for funding local emergency management in that county. Most Emergency Management Commissions have an agreement with their County Boards of Supervisors to handle administrative tasks, but it is not officially a county responsibility. Miller added that it is further complicated in that the law does not really define what emergency management is, and the agencies themselves are responsible for the legal obligation to perform duties defined under law. It is up to each Commission to define the job of the Coordinator, which is outlined in administrative rules from Homeland Security and Emergency Management. The local Commission really is responsible for what the Coordinator does, and no two coordinators are in the same situation. It is such an uncertain governance and funding structure that it can present a real complication. When the Commission certifies the emergency management budget, it is subject to the veto of the members of the local governments represented on the Commission, which creates uncertainty. Miller recommended that the study conducted three years ago on the structure of local emergency management should be revisited. The Commission noted the importance of the Emergency Management Coordinator to handle the responsibilities that fall to them. Miller explained that county Emergency Management Coordinators are responsible for managing funds that have grown, although it is not legally required. Miller noted that Emergency Management Coordinators are underfunded, understaffed, and in danger of extinction in some areas of the state.

McKeen recognized that all disasters are local, and that is an important tenet to remember. In the course of many Task Force discussions, many issue areas wanted to work closer with local Emergency Management Coordinators, which would expand the job responsibilities of these local agencies even more. It is important to understand what local emergency management is.

In the absence of chair Linda Larkin, Furler updated the group about the Public Health and Health Care Task Force meeting. Much of the discussion focused upon creating a framework to be activated in times of disaster, strengthening the infrastructure, and those organizations that provide critical services. The group spoke a lot about the creation of a ready reserve of volunteers for mental health, public health, and health care, including direct involvement of students in the health professions.

In the absence of Karris Golden, Findley provided an update to the Commission from the Cultural Heritage and Records Retention Task Force. Much like several of the other Task Forces, this group recognized that the most important immediate needs included housing for those individuals who have been displaced. In the second meeting, stakeholders noted the need

to be a part of the recovery and emergency management process before, during, and after a disaster. Cultural institutions recognized that a significant need is the lack of giving during this time, and records retention leaders have also noted that as the rebuilding continues, the need for their services will continue to grow. McKeen noted the importance of recognizing quality of life and that Iowans really want to be Iowans. The Commission discussed the importance of how to make sure that Iowans preserve what they have and how they are safeguarding what the state has.

McKeen asked the group to take a ten-minute break prior to reviewing recommendations.

Major General Dardis reconvened the meeting and turned the floor back to McKeen and Furler for discussion of the Unified Task Force Report. McKeen recalled that in each of the Task Force meetings, the starting point for the discussion and recommendations was the subsequent recommendations from the Commission's 45-Day Report. The intent in providing a Unified Task Force report was to reduce the burden of reading and organizing ideas for the Commission members, as many discussions crossed over many, if not all, of the Task Forces. Main themes included planning for response, infrastructure priorities, and coordination in rebuilding. Because so much of the rebuilding process was suggested by the Task Force members to be handled by the Rebuild Iowa Office, a special section of the Unified Report discusses the role of that office. It is very difficult to talk about the vision, even though the Task Force members had gut feelings about their priorities. The draft vision for consideration takes into account the intent and discussions from all Task Forces and will be a subject for review by the Commission. One Commission member recognized that when discussing green and environmental standards, it is also important to remember safety, as well as evaluate the long-term economic impact from property taxes. McKeen noted that as the group talks about the strategies section, some are very broadly stated, and it will be important to package together those items that need to be triggered during a Presidentially-declared disaster. The Report will leave policymakers to review the items that require legislation and behavior change, though all needed to be covered in the Report. Another Commission member noted that on page 17, the 500-year floodplain should be .2 of a percent, not .02 of a percent. This change will be made in the final copy of the Unified Task Force Report.

McKeen suggested that the group spend some time with a brief review of the issues, starting on page 9. She recognized that the case management area has been one of the most complicated issues to organize. In the Floodplain Management and Hazard Mitigation Task Force meeting, one Task Force member noted that there is a lack of personnel infrastructure to carry out the rebuilding efforts. Iowans think that case management is something different depending on what subject or program they are working on. Building a system and creating a systemic infrastructure will be a serious priority moving forward. McKeen asked if this has changed as a priority for the Commission and what they would like to think about in the long term. The Task Force indicated that case management must be organized and institutionalized to provide a better system than was available for this disaster. General Dardis agreed, and commended the Task Force for recognizing this key component for success in future planning. A Commission member recognized that there is a structure already in place for certain focused needs, such as mental health emergencies and mortgage assistance that can be built upon to design a successful case management system.

Commission members moved the discussion to the housing priority outlined in pages 11, 12, and 13 of the Unified Report and recognized that the section sets the stage for the recommendations very well. McKeen stated that some members of the Housing Task Force mentioned that old or broken infrastructure concerns will directly affect building new housing in

some areas of the state.

Regarding small business concerns, many noted lost revenue as a top concern. The Rebuild Iowa Office is working on collecting information about lost revenue from business. The long-term implications include the importance of itemizing expenses and some administrative rule changes. McKeen asked the group if there are other gaps in business assistance that need to be identified. The strength and weakness of the Unified Report is that it accurately reflected everything that was said. One of the action steps was help for big business. Without focus, it will be hard to address the issue. A Commission member suggested the Governor's Economic Advisory Council as a great resource to see the overall picture. Hajek recognized that after seeing the overall picture, the RIO is working on seeing overall specifics to see what the economic picture of the disaster was versus regular business issues. One report indicated that 25 of the 27 affected businesses in Cedar Rapids are staying. There has been a lot more focus on recovery after this disaster than after the 1993 disasters. A Commission member asked how the monies that are assisting small businesses have been distributed. Hajek noted that part is taking a bit longer than the housing assistance portion of Jumpstart: currently there are over 500 applicants for \$81 million. McKeen recognized the critical role that the Councils of Government played and will continue to play in the successful distribution of the funding in a balanced and timely way.

McKeen introduced the floodplain mapping priority. She noted the Task Force's recognition of river gauges and other necessary equipment for properly managing and planning for the future. Even though this raised the price tag, it did not deter the support for this by the Flood Plain Management and Hazard Mitigation Task Force. Insurance has always been an approach necessary when one cannot take care of the risk. The Commission discussed the importance of recognizing that currently locating in the floodplain seems to be a well-kept secret. It was recognized that many try very hard to get out of the area where flood insurance is required, and more stringent requirements might be added to eliminate some of those loopholes that end up badly affecting people in the long run.

Anecdotally, people did not speak highly about their experiences in working with those offering flood insurance. The group discussed the need to define what flood proof means. Raising the bar on what flood proof means is very important. Many of the Task Forces discussed insurance, and there was no consensus on the issue, recognizing that more study is in order before a decision on this issue is made. McKeen also recognized that there is a point where individual personal responsibility enters into the discussion, and the consequences of decisions made to insure or not insure had a lot more of the discussion time during the second round of the meetings than during the first. She added that there is an expectation from the Task Forces that floodplain mapping is going to move forward. McKeen noted that the basic LiDAR flying, photography, and map development will cost in the area of \$23.5 million, which would provide accuracy within a few inches. This cost estimate does not include hydrology, modeling, and other factors.

Miller noted that FEMA will pay for map modernization in certain areas. Issues arise when these dollars are generally allocated to map modernization for updating maps for the most populated areas first, Iowa is not a high priority for FEMA. A lot of the state's populated areas are mapped. Unpopulated areas, no matter how damaged, are priorities to be mapped under FEMA's project. Some areas of the United States will continually be at a higher risk for being damaged, and they will come first in mapping assistance. Some communities, due to development and other priorities, are working on starting the mapping process early. Miller used an example of a rural area of the state where moving forward, investment in LiDAR is a good step, but maps are not

updated until hydrology, gauges, and other ancillary items and their data are added into the overall picture. If you are going to hire something done, you get what you pay for, and so that also adds to the expense. As the Department of Agriculture and others have ownership in gauging, it is important to coordinate these efforts across agencies and levels of government.

Miller recognized that it is not enough to read gauges; this data is part of the larger picture. From the FEMA side, there is not money available. Tying gauges in to hydrology is always a complicated issue. Miller noted that there is not complete consistency in approaches between communities, but they are close enough to meet FEMA standards. The Commission recognized that the broader issue is that mapping is underfunded. The Commission also recognized that conversations are focused on financing a comprehensive statewide floodplain mapping system because it is fresh in the minds of Iowans. If policymakers are not as focused and in agreement that this is an investment, then after the next disaster the state will be right back in the same situation that it finds itself in now.

A Commission member asked about burdening local government for land use decisions and just how much that should be done. It is driven by public policy and the risk that people are willing to take. As long as the state continues to experience this type of disaster, the state is allowing for repetitive losses. The Commission members recognized that in the past when similar issues have been vetted, financing these endeavors is always a concern. McKeen recognized that the conversations of these two days underscore the importance that the Task Forces put on these issues as well.

A Commission member asked if Miller agreed that a cultural planner on staff at Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management would be beneficial. Miller answered that, to a degree, yes. One of the issues that the agency is often faced with is that they are concerned about the loss of cultural entities and records. This has been discussed as a continuity of operations issue. Miller recognized that if counties had the capacity to conduct emergency management in the optimal way, that these entities would be a part of the planning and discussion at the beginning. When you have a County Emergency Manager writing a plan to get a grant, it may not be as effective as real organizational planning from the beginning. Miller agreed that the agency could use this person and would be glad to have that capacity.

McKeen asked for discussion about the options for flexible funding and how the state gives flexibility during times of disaster that local governments are not allowed for one reason or another during non-disaster times. The Commission recognized that access to the state's rainy day fund, between now and the next disaster, would take the vetting and advance approval of the types of situations that would allow for access without legislative action. This is about putting waivers and plans in place to be available during times of disaster and could be applied to other items of consideration for the Commission. The group discussed how the payments would be handled by the IRS and locals: Hajek added that this has been verified and taxes will not be incurred on those emergency granted funds.

The Commission discussed the need to do more research about the property tax revenue collection in counties. Hajek noted that the RIO does not yet have the overall picture, but it is information that the office is tracking and will share that information when it is available.

McKeen discussed the regional planning recommendation and that it takes a step further than the floodplain mapping recommendation. It addresses the state actively promoting and setting out models, plans, technical assistance, and policy. The intent of this recommendation was to encourage regional planning. Many Task Force members recognized that not planning on a

regional basis would be doing a great disservice to neighbors. McKeen recognized that thinking that this recommendation is a good idea is the easy part, but actually planning on a regional basis is much more difficult. Commission members asked if this recommendation meant zoning. McKeen clarified that this recommendation's intent would be for communities to get together on a basis larger than counties. A Commission member recognized that zoning would be an important consideration for planning. McKeen noted that many Task Force members were not sure that they wanted to say that the state should require zoning. Furler added that the Public Health and Health Care Task Force also suggested an aspect of regional planning for transporting supplies. A Commission member commented that he looks at the zoning issue as being a timely concern, and that the state should demand zoning and land use coordination through governance.

Commission members discussed combining issue number nine with issue number seven. McKeen agreed that could happen, as long as "public health" and "case management" were carefully defined in the transition. A Commission member added that recommendation six and seven also seemed to be a lot alike. The Commission recognized that people do not like the word "mandate," but that the word "encourage" may not be strong enough. If regional planning is not getting done, maybe "require" would be more appropriate. McKeen noted that these are tough decisions, and that is why the group has met.

McKeen recognized that in issue number 10 that communities have suffered a great deal in losses that they have incurred and the importance of keeping these losses in mind as they move forward and rebuild. She noted that it is warmer and fuzzier than some other issues discussed today, but there are infrastructure and economic development concerns embedded within this issue.

A Commission member asked about infrastructure and the consideration for heavy rail and electricity, and whether they are related to the disaster or if are they just about things that could be nice to accomplish. Members recognized that these examples are very interesting and there are so many more to consider that would be nice. They recognized the need to create a strong connection between the examples and the disaster. Going green, in terms of rebuilding, makes sense, or when recognizing a gap, but others are not as clear. Another Commission member recognized that the railroads were affected, and this was suggested as a green initiative. The Commission members discussed how much of the discussion should look at advancing the state as part of the Commission's charge, or to look just at what we can make better as it relates strictly to the disaster. If the Commission is going to concentrate on developing more ideas, why end with these items, should there be a larger list? The group recognized that these particular examples are in the report because they were brought up during the Task Force meetings. A Commission member recognized that this is a piecemeal approach, but provides some context to stretch the thinking of state policymakers.

McKeen recognized that the group has the ability to support any of these suggested items at a variety of levels and detail that suits their priorities. Support could include a notation, detail about the agency that should undertake the work, and to what level. McKeen acknowledged that the 500 people that participated in the Task Force varied in their opinions; some that thought things were going pretty well, some that recognized needs for the future. She reminded the group that the Rebuild Iowa Office and the Task Forces were created under Executive Order and are not permanent. There is a delimited responsibility, and this effort is to recommend under that responsibility, what could happen.

General Dardis suggested starting the conversation on November 7th with the subsequent

recommendations from the 45-Day Report. McKeen distributed a color-coded explanation document that uses the subsequent recommendations as a starting point and adds the Unified Task Force Report recommendations on what should be kept, added to, or adjusted.

McKeen thanked the Commission for their diligence and commitment to their work.

The meeting adjourned at 5:04 pm.

November 7, 2008 8:00 am – 12:00 pm

Opening Comments and Updates

Major General Dardis welcomed the group and said that they would have a full meeting for the morning. He welcomed Tina Potthoff to discuss the plan for the 120-Day Report. Potthoff introduced her self as the Communications Director for the Rebuild Iowa Office, and said the report will be released November 17. Potthoff will be in one-on-one contact with Commission members and invited them to participate in the release of the report. A Commission member asked where the release will be, and Potthoff said the location is yet to be decided, but will involve an event. General Dardis turned the meeting over to SPPG to facilitate.

Finalize Recommendations and Strategies

McKeen thanked Zook for making arrangements for the day. She said the challenge for the morning will be to recognize how to transition the 45-Day Report recommendations, which were intended as immediate recommendations, listed in priority order. McKeen said that she heard from the group that they did not want to set recommendations in priority order, but in logical order. She said that there is nothing sacred about the current order; it can be changed to coincide with the discussion. She said that SPPG's job is to absorb the information and process it to turn it into a report. McKeen asked group members to highlight themes from the previous day's meeting. She said that she heard group members express that this report's message is that the recommendations are imperative to complete because a disaster of the same magnitude could happen again. A Commission member agreed, but said she did not think it was the case for all recommendations. Some are very high priority, and others are good, but not as crucial. General Dardis said that the first report focused on immediate, high priority needs, and the importance is still there for the long-term recommendations, but the immediacy may have since diminished. He asked if the message needed to be different with individual recommendations and suggested that the group adjust the phrasing to make distinctions. Another group member said that acting immediately was important during the first report, and adopting the recommendations will be the theme for the second report.

Furler directed group members to the handout and color coding to indicate recommendations from the Unified Task Force Report and subsequent recommendations from the first Commission report. There was a question about how to marry the recommendations to the appropriate level for the report, with reference to page five. McKeen said the goal of the day will be to incorporate recommendations and said it will not be possible to identify absolutely every issue that has to be addressed in great detail. A group member said he recognized the limitations of the report, but expressed concern that the work of people involved is not lost. General Dardis said that he saw it as the mission of the RIO to look at the two reports to make the recommendations happen. Furler said that one challenge to putting together the Unified Task Force Report was the balance to bring forward diversity of all the Task Forces. McKeen said that the group will need to make sure it is a stand-alone document. A Commission member

commented that she can accept the report without a specific topic area recommendation, but that comments from members from her Task Force are reflected in broader recommendations.

McKeen said that the state has tended to think about tangible needs and asked a group member if it is all right to blend the Task Force areas together. The group member responded that she thought the report has to be blended, so that there is not too much information that overwhelms the reader and to be concise. She said she liked the way it was organized and suggested that there may be a way to code the report. McKeen directed the group to the subsequent recommendations, beginning with the case management recommendation and strategies. Items in orange are those that were discussed by various Task Forces on how to go about accomplishing the recommendations. Turquoise items are strategies from the 45-Day Report. There was a question about overlap between recommendations, and McKeen said that this issue might need to be addressed. A Commission member said she did not want to see a medical model of case management, but wanted it to address all human needs that happen during a disaster. McKeen said that case management is not the ideal term, and the intention is having a one-stop shop for all types of needs to be addressed. General Dardis said he thought that was included in the 45-Day Report, and it was agreed that a discussion of what is meant by case management needs to be used in the 120-Day Report.

There was discussion about the bullet points under the first recommendation, and the group decided to delete the first bullet, but there may be a need for the third bullet point. The group agreed to move on to the second recommendation of housing.

McKeen asked Davis to review the process for housing, and he said that the bullets have been divided into categories of funding and incentives, incorporation of design standards (from The University of Iowa), tracking and monitoring development, reviewing state policies in order to expedite, and finding some way to offer assistance to affected families. He directed the group to look at the recommendations through the categories and put them together to reflect those categories. A Commission member said she thought it made sense from an organizational standpoint but said that she wanted to make sure that people are aware of where they are building according to zoning, so that housing is sustainable. Davis described the system for labeling the categories.

McKeen highlighted the third recommendation and asked a group member to speak on it; he said that he thought the report is very complete, and the Legislature will be able to add to it, although the recommendations exceed what the state is able to do. He said he would like to see the group focus more, would like to highlight global warming, would like to see the state mitigate disasters in the future, and saw item three as a jobs initiative that he would like the Legislature to consider. He said that he would like to reduce expectations going forward and encouraged the group to look at covering basic human needs for a relatively short period of time in the future.

A Commission member said that he liked the idea of incentives and asked why waiving sales tax was not included in the report in recommendation three, as it was in the 45-Day Report. There was discussion of how the reports would intertwine and stand alone. McKeen said the first report focused on immediate needs and said she thought that was covered already. She asked if it was necessary to repeat the issue. McKeen said she believed that some things need to be repeated because some people will read the 120-Day Report without reading the 45-Day Report, so both should include such things as what the group means by case management. General Dardis said that he thought the 45-Day Report stood on its own, and some of the ideas have matured, which may be included in the 120-Day Report. McKeen said that the immediate

needs were set in a priority order and addressed the need for that point in time, and the needs going forward may adjust. McKeen said that waiving sales tax can be added to number three, as an example. A group member asked about the enforcement of who qualifies for relief of sales tax and asked if it would involve a FEMA card or insurance claim. Group members agreed that enforcement may be hard to implement. McKeen said that she saw policymakers making those decisions, and it was noted that this issue of enforcement will apply to other recommendations. General Dardis said he saw that as the role of the RIO. There was a question about assignable tax credits and whether they would be applied to this disaster, and McKeen said that she saw that as the intention of the recommendation and noted that the point will be clarified.

McKeen highlighted the first two orange items under Recommendation Three and said that they note the activities that need to be done at the state level and that need to be done at the local level that are contingent upon disasters. The aim in saying they would be consistent across jurisdictions is that they would be equally accessed. There was a question about whether a local jurisdiction would be forced to do something they do not feel they can, and a group member answered that the goal is to provide flexibility and options for localities. McKeen said that the state should work with local governments to address issues they faced during this disaster.

She moved the group on to Recommendation Four and asked for comment. General Dardis asked if the word “should” could be examined to include stronger language. There was discussion about the possibilities of words to use; suggestions included “require” instead of “complete.” A Commission member said he did not want to limit the state to one technology (LiDAR) and wanted to give communities the option to use other technologies to meet FEMA standards. Miller said that the process is a three-year process for FEMA to accept the map, regardless of the technology used. A group read from a document that was developed by the Department of Natural Resources and the Homeland Security and Emergency Management Division for the RIO, and the goal is to have a published visual floodplain map. Miller said that a number of state agencies have invested in LiDAR because it can be used for multiple purposes. They provide the basis for floodplain mapping, and it will take a long time to get where the state needs to go. There is a difference between the usefulness of the map and having the map accepted by FEMA. One is a planning tool to be used by all, and another is a process of getting approval for insurance, regulation, assistance, and other purposes. McKeen clarified that a map could be completed in less than three years to be used for planning, while it is waiting for approval. Miller said that the map is only as good as the technology behind it, which is becoming geo-based technology. LiDAR is a good base for that, which is why state agencies want to use it. McKeen said that experience has shown that FEMA usually accepts maps created by LiDAR. Miller said that FEMA’s experience also includes public hearings because of the implications and history involved in creating floodplain maps.

A Commission member said that she saw the chance to combine the first three strategies and add to the second orange point to set the tone that the recommendation has to happen. General Dardis said that there could be “strongly encourage to fund” added to the recommendation. Hajek said the RIO is exploring other funding options. There was a question of how to address updating the maps, so that they are maintained. Miller said that it is in the interest of the community to keep maps updated for development issues. Miller said that technology changes may be involved, too, and the exciting part is that the map has multiple purposes, which is why the Iowa Department of Transportation, the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship, the Iowa Department of Natural Resources, and the Homeland Security and Emergency Management Division are all interested in it. It was noted that when development is happening near or in the floodplain, DNR requires inclusion of the floodplain map. A Commission member said that Iowa City is blessed with the Iowa Institute for Hydrologic

Research, which is world renowned, and suggested that the entity should be part of the future work to provide experience for students. McKeen said that could be included in resources that should be available. Furler added a note about establishing guidelines for regular updates of floodplain maps.

The group moved on to Recommendation Five, of identifying, creating, and sustaining funding options for local and state governments in rebuilding an even better Iowa. There was a question about whether it required a constitutional amendment, and Furler said that it would for the bonding issue. A Commission member suggested that the bonding cap needs to be raised for some communities; it is currently 5% of the assessed value. It was suggested that the 120-Day Report include the bonding cap from the 45-Day Report. There was a question about whether the state would establish exceptions for communities, whether they could afford it or not. Furler said that the intention would be to create consistent options for communities to choose from, and said that clarification can be made in the report. General Dardis asked if this recommendation would involve the Rainy Day Fund, and McKeen said that the fund is included in the laundry list in the 45-Day Report as an example, so that thinking would not be limited in the future. There was discussion about whether or not to include the examples in the 120-Day Report. McKeen said that there may need to be a context piece included for each issue, to explain some of the thinking, instead of just listing them. General Dardis said that during the 2008 disaster, there was no contingency fund available, and the Governor could not get to the Rainy Day Fund without a special session. He said there is a need for the Governor to access the Rainy Day Fund without a special session. A Commission member said that he thought it would be appropriate to use it during the 2008 disaster. There was discussion about whether to create a contingency plan or use the Rainy Day Fund. McKeen said that the task is to address the need while allowing policymakers the decision making capacity. General Dardis said that he saw the RIO as moving forward recommendations to the Iowa General Assembly. He said that there is a need for communities to access funding now, which would be addressed by a contingency fund, which is now being addressed by Jumpstart funds.

McKeen said that contingencies would provide a mechanism to meet the needs such as Jumpstart funds are meeting and could be accessed under pre-determined terms. General Dardis said the intention would be to have assistance there and ready to go. A group member said that this disaster is of a huge magnitude and saw the need for smaller disasters to be able to access these sorts of resources. General Dardis said that the decision for use of the Rainy Day Fund or creation of a contingency fund would be up to the Legislature.

McKeen directed the group to Recommendation Six and reviewed the strategies. During the Task Force meetings, the need to work with the Iowa Emergency Management Association came through as a theme. She said that demonstrating the need for funding for local emergency management will be necessary to justify additional resources. A group member asked if the recommendation should be changed to something stronger. The group members discussed using the word “must” or “will” instead of “should” and clarified language on the floodplain mapping recommendation. A Commission member said that he thought that local areas need to be adequately funded and he did not see a need to define that, but rather, to let policymakers figure that out. General Dardis said that the report says there is a need for the capacity to be there, but leaves the process open. He said that he saw this as a very important issue that had implications for how this disaster was handled.

There was discussion about the Iowa Emergency Management Association and their internal disagreement on how they want the local Emergency Management system in Iowa to be funded. Some wanted it to be funded through the state, and some wanted it to be funded

through local governments. McKeen said that the recommendation could be strengthened by saying “the state is seeking a plan from local Emergency Management for how they will achieve the capacity for this.” Miller said that this is a long-standing issue; back in the early 1990s, they changed the local Emergency Management system. He noted that just because a Commission representative from a local area agreed to the budget does not mean elected officials in local areas will support it. There was discussion on the proper level of state support, and that while there have been a number of solutions offered, it will be difficult to decide, based on a diverse array of opinions on the topic among those most directly affected by the issue.

A Commission member said that Emergency Management entities would want to put something together, since they currently do not know their budgets from year to year. Miller said that in the clips this morning, there was discussion of the appropriate level of state response, and affordability is an issue. Miller said his opinion was that there has to be base-level capacity in all areas. McKeen said that it is not the intention of the recommendation to define minimum capability. Miller disagreed and said there is a need for standards across areas, since they are coming from FEMA and the US Department of Homeland Security, and the gap is growing between areas around the state in terms of discrepancies in funding.

McKeen asked how to address that gap, and Miller said that there is a need to sit down with all partners and ask how the structure, capacity, and funding mechanism should be built. A group member asked if it would be appropriate for the state to come up with the guidelines and support communities through a match level. McKeen said that during the previous report, it was listed as “the state should seek funding mechanisms.” Miller said that what the state will receive in Emergency Management grants will be \$4 million, and the tradition is to pass half of that on to local governments. Miller said that there are requirements to conduct exercises, levels of training, and planning. Homeland Security grants provide some funding (that is now decreasing), which goes to firefighters, police units, and incident management teams, to build capacity in the state. He said that was meant as seed money from the federal government, and the conversation needs to involve how to sustain the minimum capacity. McKeen said that she saw the Commission as making this a priority at the state level, with some options.

Miller said that the problem with some grant levels received is that base qualifications have to be met to get the funding, but some localities do not have that required capacity. Furler directed the group to the strategies. There was discussion about local capacity to levy funds and that political will can contribute to whether or not this happens. A Commission member asked if “work with Emergency Management to evaluate” was strong enough, and there was discussion of making the Association a taxing authority. SPPG will draft something for discussion on the call.

McKeen directed the group to discuss Recommendation Seven, which involves planning. She said that Councils of Government (COGs) have minimal resources and may need to build capacity. A Commission member said that this is similar to the previous recommendation and asked if the strategy expresses that COGs need more funding. He suggested that the entities that support COGs step up to the plate to increase funding. A group member asked if the COGs received Economic Development Administration (EDA) grants for an employee for the next few years, and Hajek confirmed this. It was noted that the administration side of it may be enough to prevent the ability to hire additional staff; some counties do not have enough funding to hire city clerks, and there was discussion of the difficulties that counties face with funding. McKeen said that supporting integrated regional planning is another piece that the COGs have a role in and may need to be carved out. She asked what the expectations for regional planning are and asked if the language is strong enough.

A Commission member said that it is needed so that communities can coordinate to determine effects and consequences of decisions downstream. He said that doing it is necessary, but there are consequences of planning. Localities do not like mandates, especially those that are unfunded. One group member said she was not sure there is a win-win situation, and there should not be decisions made in a vacuum. There was a comment that if there is not a recommendation for regional planning, it is not going to happen and will go back to the way it was before the disasters. McKeen asked if the recommendation was a little soft, and group members agreed. There was a suggestion that Emergency Management should go to regional planning, and someone asked if the comprehensive plan for watersheds should also be included. McKeen said that comprehensive planning, with or without disasters, is something that needs to happen according to many of the comments during Task Force meetings. A Commission member said that he saw some things that could be combined, but thought that floodplain mapping needs to be its own. There was a comment that there is no comprehensive plan for Iowa's rivers, and McKeen said that it seems as if the special project would come into play in the regions where they are being studied. Furler said that most of that comes into play in Recommendation Nine. General Dardis asked how similar nine is to seven. McKeen said she saw nine as saying that the state needs to take a role in this planning, but in seven, the responsibility is on the locals, and they may not get it done. McKeen said that the order of the recommendations may need to be adjusted, so that related things are listed together.

A group member said that he saw this as a broader issue and brought up the topic of local entities having the resources to support planning and services. McKeen asked the group if they wanted to be direct in the report, if they want to say what really needs to be done, and to be abrasive enough to cause the conversation to occur. Group members agreed. Group members discussed the need to have honest, open discussions. Furler suggested that this topic might be one of the overarching themes to include in the report. McKeen clarified by asking if the group's stance is that this issue is so important that the Commission is willing to take stands that have not yet been taken. Commission members confirmed that they agreed with this. There was discussion on how to word the recommendation.

McKeen said that Recommendation Seven will be posed in tandem with number nine and will clarify that it is necessary for the state to step up to determine expectations and help support, train, and incent locals to enable local entities to do what they need to do.

She directed the group to Recommendation Eight and said that the list is not comprehensive. A Commission member asked if there was a way to consolidate the list, and McKeen suggested putting them into issue areas so that the appropriate entities can address them. There was a question asked about homeowner insurance and the casualties that insurance does not cover, and a group member suggested including information for homeowners. McKeen asked if it was a public policy level issue. General Dardis said it might be too detailed to put forward. There was a question about whether the Insurance Commissioner has some responsibility to protect and educate people, and an example of the state of Florida was given. They are their own insurer because of issues they faced. McKeen said that she would include that issue in Recommendation Nine. Riley clarified that most insurance exclusions are common to all states and some exclusions can be bought back in most states (i.e. sewer backup, earthquake). McKeen said there may be some Iowa questions that the group may want to address. She directed the group to take a break and regroup in ten minutes.

McKeen reconvened the group and directed them to Recommendation Ten. The specificity of the strategies was noted and there was a question about whether they were covered in other

places. McKeen said that non-profits are eligible for Jumpstart funds, but that is only if they are incorporated. Conversations during the first report phase delayed cultural considerations that are very important to communities until this second round, and they were not covered elsewhere. A guest said that in state construction, a half-percent of funding is reserved for public art. Group members agreed to this recommendation.

McKeen directed the Commission to page eight and the infrastructure issue. A Commission member said he did not see a need for planning, but rather for funding. Furler said that the Infrastructure and Transportation Task Force presented some challenges in knowing what to do with funding if they had it. McKeen said the strategy covers the issue of state responsibility and that there should be some expectations for state level input. There was a comment that infrastructure is already regulated by the state, and McKeen said that there are some issues, such as safe rooms, green building principles, and universal design, that are recovery issues that may need to be brought to broader attention. McKeen said that the Long Term Recovery and Floodplain Management and Hazard Mitigation Task Forces both brought the issue forward. McKeen asked if funding for infrastructure should be included in context or added as a recommendation. Furler said that something could be added about the state seeking funding.

There was a question about “personnel infrastructure” to fulfill gaps and why the resources are not devoted to recovery so that agencies are able to be responsive. Miller said that part of the ongoing discussion is that the National Flood Insurance Program and flood management are grant-driven. As grants decline, staff members are lost, and in other cases, there are restrictions on use of funds. In DNR, there are priorities and mandates, and the office that addresses flooding no longer has the grants to sustain certain staffing levels. Some agencies are able to hire temporary staff, but sometimes the expertise is not available within the state. There is also an issue of sustaining capacity after the disaster. A Commission member asked about the purpose of the strategy, and McKeen said it will involve finding ways to provide services, but the answer is not there on how to do that. A group member commented that taking samples is necessary for public health, and the recommendation was to use temporary staff to increase capacity during disasters. Furler suggested writing “statewide capacity” instead of “state capacity.” McKeen said that disease surveillance is another issue that is related.

McKeen highlighted the issue of increases in domestic violence, which is included in issues that are going unaddressed. A group member said that he did not see it as infrastructure issue, and another Commission member said she saw “personnel infrastructure” as state infrastructure. Another person added that DNR permitting was an issue that was overwhelming to a guest of the Task Force. Group members discussed having the infrastructure and systems in place to react to a disaster.

A Commission member said that a comprehensive infrastructure plan is already in place and said he did not think it needed to be in this recommendation, as well as the assessment of landfill capacity. Furler said that there may be a need to put the strategies in there to reinforce their importance in the mind of the reader. General Dardis agreed and said that “continue” could be added to clarify.

McKeen directed the group to discuss the Rebuild Iowa Office Roles and Responsibilities. There was a question about what it meant to “institutionalize” the Rebuild Iowa Office, and McKeen said that the word may be changed to “formalize.” A group member agreed and said that there is a need to oversee activities, but that it needs to be revisited after some period of time. A group member asked if there is a need to have a Commission to advise the Office. McKeen

suggested adding “2008” to the recommendation. Davis recommended adding “develop and coordinate” to state policy strategies. McKeen said that she will ask for consensus on the call.

A Commission member asked if design standards would be a part of waivers, and McKeen said that they were.

Vision for Iowa’s Recovery

A Commission member noted that on July 17, they were called together to respond to the crisis and were asked to give recommendations. He recognized the need for policymakers to make tough decisions, and greater challenges because of the global financial meltdown. He noted that many Iowans are still hurting and still need help, and are watching the group to see how they handle this. He said that he sees his grandchildren and other children as the vision for the future and would like to see a place for them to live, work, and raise a family some day. He said that he saw it as rebuilding one community at a time, working together. McKeen said that is the reality and in some ways the only way to move forward.

McKeen said that the Governor has asked for a vision for recovery to be included in the report and asked if elements from the recommendations could be incorporated into the Commission report. She mentioned that Task Forces talked about not putting things back to the way they were, but thinking of the generations to come to express the hope, expectation, and determination that came out of the Task Force meetings. McKeen asked how to convey that this effort is about people, as well as the inspiration behind it, so that the Governor and General Assembly can think about what this is ultimately about, instead of just rebuilding roads and bridges. Commission members said they thought the vision was well-put and important. General Dardis asked how the global role was defined, and McKeen said she was relating to Iowa’s economic development and technology components. There was discussion about elements to include in order to be clear about expectations regarding the future. A group member noted that now there is an opportunity to redo the whole system and avoid the notion that Iowa is a flyover state, and there is a need to address young people’s concerns about what they look for in a community.

There was discussion about ways to welcome people to the state. McKeen said that a section of the report will frame the expectations for the vision and will lead into the report recommendations and strategies. She welcomed additional suggestions.

Process to Finalize Report

McKeen said the report will look similar to, but not identical to, the 45-Day Report, in that there will not be as much narrative (i.e. no damages section). She said that each of the 12 recommendations will be reordered to state the recommendation, including narrative explanation, followed by strategies. SPPG has a goal of sending the draft report by noon on Thursday, November 13 via email. She asked if anyone needed the report in hard copy, and no one responded. Potthoff will follow up with conference call information. Changes will be made between Wednesday and Friday, for the Monday, November 17 submission to the Governor’s Office.

Ongoing Role of the Rebuild Iowa Advisory Commission

Major General Dardis said that the two reports will be done shortly and that the Executive Order notes that the Commission will continue, although the time commitment will change drastically. He said that he saw an opportunity for the Governor to address certain issues that may come up, with reports from the RIO, and he saw the ongoing mission of the Commission as providing oversight to the RIO. General Dardis said that the mode of communication will have to be

determined and asked Commission members to think about whether they want to continue and said that they will check in later. He said that he envisioned quarterly communication via phone or email with a quarterly report to the Governor that will include updates from the RIO and whether the RIO is on track. He asked Commission members to think about their roles and thanked everyone for their efforts in the initiative. He said that he has enjoyed working together and expressed pride in their reports. A Commission member thanked General Dardis for his leadership, and another group member thanked SPPG staff for their efforts. General Dardis thanked RIO staff for their work. General Dardis adjourned the meeting.